

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kubota et al.* (USPN 6,157,430).

Claims 3, 4, 8-11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota et al.* (USPN 6,157,430) in view of *Kaneko et al.* (USPN 6,433,842).

Claim 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota et al.* (USPN 6,157,430).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 6, have cancelled claims 2 and 5 without prejudice or disclaimer, and have added new claim 71. In addition, Applicants have cancelled withdrawn claims 15-70 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 6-14, and 71 are presently pending.

The Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kubota et al.* (USPN 6,157,430). Claims 3, 4, 8-11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota et al.* (USPN 6,157,430) in view of *Kaneko et al.* (USPN 6,433,842). Claim 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota et al.* (USPN 6,157,430). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, as amended, Applicants respectfully assert that *Kubota et al.* does not teach or suggest a combination at least one Ti layer on at least one layer of a gate electrode, a semiconductor layer, and a source/drain electrodes of a thin film transistor. *Kubota et al.* fails to disclose at least this claim feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the applied art.

With respect to independent claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that *Kubota et al.* does not teach or suggest a combination including a metal masking layer in the thin film transistor. Here, Applicants respectfully assert that one cannot consider the Ti layer of column 9, lines 11-15, of *Kubota et al.* to be a “metal masking layer” as claimed because it lacks a structure such that it has substantially common boundaries with the layer that it masks. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claim 12 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully note that the Office Action does not rely on *Kaneko et al.* to disclose these features. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that *Kaneko et al.* cannot remedy the above-noted deficiencies. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3-4, 6-11, 13-15 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 12, and the reasons set forth above. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that new dependent claim 71 is allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Date: November 10, 2005

By:



Robert J. Goodell

Reg. No. 41,040

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel.: (202) 739-3000

Fax.: (202) 739-3001